



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,132	06/16/2005	Klaus Schultes	272480US0PCT	2289
22850 7590 06/10/2011 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER REDDY, KARUNA P				
ART UNIT 1764		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 06/10/2011		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

RECORD OF ORAL HEARING  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

*Ex Parte* KLAUS SCHULTES *et al.*

Appeal 2010-005278  
Application 10/539,132  
Technology Center 1700

Oral Hearing Held: Tuesday, April 12, 2011

Before CHUNG K. PAK, KAREN M. HASTINGS and  
MICHAEL P. COLAIANNI, Administrative Patent Judges

ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT:

HARRIS A. PITLICK, ESQ.  
Oblon, Spivak, McClelland, Maier & Neustadt, LLP  
1940 Duke St.  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
(703) 413-3000

1           *The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Tuesday,*  
2   *April 12, 2011, commencing at 10:25 a.m., at the U.S. Patent and*  
3   *Trademark Office, 600 Dulany Street, 9th Floor, Hearing Room A,*  
4   *Alexandria, Virginia, before B. Stanley Ross, notary public.*

5  
6           JUDGE PAK: Mr. Pitlick, welcome.

7           Mr. Pitlick, you've got 20 minutes, and you can start anytime  
8   you wish.

9           MR. PITLICK: Okay. The invention here is a process for  
10   preparing an aqueous polymer dispersion of what's currently known as a --  
11   basically a core shell polymer.

12          The process begins with a particular starting material. You get  
13   a certain seed particle radius, and then you have a number of compositions  
14   emulsified -- emulsified form to get the core of your shell and your shell.

15          The most important, let's say, element of this particular  
16   invention is the combination of having, in effect, a solid amount of at least  
17   50 percent, together with a coagulate amount of -- quite low -- it's than 0.1  
18   percent -- I'm sorry -- 0.1 percent or less by weight, and we've disclosed in  
19   the specification various prior art processes that are somewhat similar but  
20   have not been able to obtain this combination of high solids content and low  
21   coagulate content.

22          We do have some comparative data in the specification which  
23   shows that similar monomer compositions for the various core and shell

1 layers still were not able to achieve both the combination of a high solids  
2 content and a low coagulum amount.

3 So, the rejections here -- there are basically three sets of  
4 rejections, all prior art rejections. They all rely on Hoffman et. al -- sorry,  
5 just Hoffman -- and the examiner alternatively relies on three other  
6 references -- to wit, Takarabe et. al and Morningstar et. al -- and then there's  
7 some further rejections along another art dealing with some of the other  
8 dependent claims.

9 I think the briefs pretty much set forth our position, and there is  
10 really no prima facie case, but nevertheless, the comparative data still needs  
11 to be considered for purposes of patentability.

12 The comparative samples which we've described in the  
13 specification and which we also rely on are actually closer than any of the  
14 examples or compositions relied on by the applied prior art, and in view of  
15 cases such the Ex parte Humber Board decision, which is still valid, which  
16 we cite, certainly, as I say, the comparative data is closer to any of the art  
17 and certainly it's valid to consider that for the comparative examples.

18 That's basically it in a nutshell, and I'll be happy to answer any  
19 questions you might have.

20 JUDGE COLAIANNI: I have a question. I notice you had  
21 some product-by-process claims, I think 29 onward. How does that analysis  
22 you just described square with the examiner's case, which is that, you know,  
23 you have a similar composition, similar method, so why is the product  
24 necessarily different?

1           MR. PITLICK: Well, the comparative data shows that there are  
2 differences in the product, and so, I know when you have a product by  
3 process and the product appears to be at least similar if not the same as the  
4 art, you've got to show that the process basically lends certain compositional  
5 limitations or changes to the composition. I think the comparative data  
6 actually shows that.

7           JUDGE PAK: Any other questions?

8           Thank you for coming. We will consider the argument.

9           (Whereupon, at 10:30 a.m., the proceedings were concluded.)